



ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART C 2012-13

Submitted January 24, 2014
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:	2
Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	4
Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.....	8
Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:.....	10
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	
Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	15
A. Know their rights;	
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and	
C. Help their children develop and learn.	
Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.	19
Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.	21
Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.....	22
Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:	25
A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services within acceptable timelines;	
B. Notified SEA and LEA within acceptable timelines, consistent with the State's opt out policy; and	
C. Conducted the transition conference within acceptable timelines, with approval of the family.	
Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.....	33
Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.....	38
Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.....	39
Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted)....	40
Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.....	41
Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	42

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) is the lead State agency for Part C of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention program, First Steps, is operated through contracts in ten regions across the State and a Central Finance Office (CFO). The ten regional offices are known as System Points of Entry (SPOEs) and they provide service coordination, evaluation and eligibility determination, as well as all local administrative activities for the program. The State contracts with a single entity in each region to fulfill the SPOE functions. Independent providers enroll with the CFO and provide direct services to children and families as directed by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

This Annual Performance Report (APR) covers federal fiscal year 2012, which is the State fiscal year 2013 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013). The time period covered by this report is referred to as "2012-2013" to eliminate confusion due to the differing State and federal fiscal year terminology.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This APR was developed with review and input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the SPOEs, as was the State Performance Plan (SPP). On December 23, 2013, the SPOE contractors and the SICC received a draft of the SPP/APR documents. These groups were asked to provide feedback to the Department so that recommendations could be considered and incorporated into the final document prior to the scheduled review of the final draft at the January 10, 2014, SICC meeting. At this meeting, the SICC approved the report and accepted it as their annual report. The SICC Certification of the APR is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>.

Public Dissemination and Reporting: Missouri's SPP and APR are available for public viewing on the Department website at <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>. This webpage also provides a link to the public reporting by SPOE region. These reports allow the public to review the State's SPP targets and be aware of any progress/slippage at the State and local levels.

In addition to the annual reporting of the APR, the Office of Special Education reports annually to the regional SPOE offices and the SICC on progress/slippage across the State during the previous year concerning the State's targets addressed in the SPP. During these discussions, indicators are examined and evaluated related to the Improvement Activities described in the SPP. Data are tracked and reviewed periodically during the year to identify current trends that may require immediate, targeted technical assistance to individual regions within the State. The SICC certifies this APR report as their annual report to the Governor and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

Monitoring Procedures: The ten SPOEs are divided into two sets of five for monitoring purposes. Each set of five SPOEs is representative of the State as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar. Each set of SPOEs receives a compliance review every other year.

The monitoring data reported in this APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records and SPOE staff interviews in accordance with compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard copy records and data in the web-based system. Two randomly selected records from each Service Coordinator's caseload of active children in fiscal year 2012-13 were reviewed. The number of Service Coordinators reviewed ranged from six in the smallest SPOE to 15 in the largest SPOE.

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the State ensures that each SPOE agency with noncompliance identified from any source: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieve 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Corrective Action Plans are required for all identified noncompliance and all noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but within 12 months of the SPOE agency's notification of the findings. To verify the correction of noncompliance, State staff request updated data as part of the follow-up review.

The data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and SPOEs receive a report of correction of noncompliance only when all correction has been verified.

Individual Corrective Action Plans are required for all findings of individual child noncompliance. Noncompliance is expected to be corrected at 100% within 60 days, but must be corrected within 12 months from the date of notification of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of the program. Documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected must be provided.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages in the amount equal to one-half percent of the annual contract price.

Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities: The Office of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Office of Special Education staff in a model for evaluating Improvement Activities. In recent years, the model has been revised with the assistance of the NCRRC in order to further analyze improvement activities. The Office of Special Education staff continue to review existing Improvement Activities, align those activities with relevant contractual activities, and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for those activities. The Office of Special Education will continue to collaborate with the NCRRC and work on the evaluation of Improvement Activities in 2013-14.

Regional Technical Assistance: The Department employs five Area Directors to work as a program unit within the field. Each Area Director provides direction, training and problem solving for two SPOE regions. The Area Directors also function as the statewide technical assistance resource for the program which enables the lead agency to provide a consistent message to the early intervention community. The Area Directors are supervised by the Coordinator of the First Steps Program, who is employed by the Department.

Transdisciplinary Teams: The Area Directors are an integral part of the implementation of Early Intervention Teams, Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. In 2012-13, the contractual requirement for SPOEs to implement the team model increased to 100% of new families assigned to teams from 50%. This increase in requirements boosted the statewide implementation of the model. The Area Directors provide ongoing guidance and instruction to regional SPOE offices and providers to continue mentoring teams as Missouri moves from implementation to evaluation of the service delivery model.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 87.1%, Missouri did not meet the target for this indicator.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:

Data reported below were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures. See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures." Indicator 1 results were based on a review of two randomly selected IFSP files for every Service Coordinator from five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Description	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (within 30 days of parent consent)	61	47	58
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who have acceptable reasons for the delay in initiation of early intervention services*	14	15	16
Total number of infants and toddlers who receive all IFSP services within 30 days or with acceptable reasons*	75	62	74
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who have unacceptable reasons for the delay in initiation of early intervention services	7	14	11
Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	82	76	85
Percent of infants and toddler with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner*	91.5%	81.6%	87.1%

* Both the infants and toddlers receiving all services within 30 days (numerator) and the total infants and toddlers receiving IFSP services (denominator) include children whose delays in initiation of services were due to exceptional family circumstances.

In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service was provided.

In 2012-13, a total of 85 records were reviewed for timely services. Of the 85 records, 27 had delayed services resulting in 16 with acceptable reasons and 11 (12.9%) with unacceptable reasons.

Acceptable reasons for untimely services include: Authorization/Billing Issue, Parent/Child Delay, and IFSP Team Decision. An Authorization/Billing issue indicates the service actually did begin within 30 days, but an issue with the entry of an authorization or the provider's billing for the service made it appear as though the service did not start within 30 days. A Parent/Child Delay indicates exceptional family circumstances (e.g., child illness/hospitalization, family vacation, and unable to locate family). An IFSP Team Decision indicates the IFSP Team decided the initiation of services should not commence within the first 30 days after the team meeting.

Unacceptable reasons for untimely services include: Provider Delay, Service Coordinator Delay, and No Provider Available. A Provider Delay indicates the provider was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A Service Coordinator Delay indicates the Service Coordinator was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A No Provider Available indicates no provider could be located to provide a service.

When at least one service on the child's IFSP was untimely due to an unacceptable reason, the child was included under **Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services**. The table below shows the distribution of reasons for untimely services.

Acceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	Number
Authorization/Billing Issue (no actual delay in provision of services)	3
Parent/Child Delay (exceptional family circumstances)	8
IFSP Team Decision	5
Total	16
Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	Number
Provider Delay	3
Service Coordinator Delay	5
No Provider Available	3
Total	11

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Though the State did not meet the target of 100%, progress from the previous year is reported.

The results for this indicator found 11 of the 85 children (12.9%) had only one unacceptable reason for untimely services. Upon analysis of the 11 unacceptable reasons for untimely services, it was determined three of the five SPOE regions had unacceptable reasons for untimely services. Within the three SPOE regions, the number of unacceptable reasons was evenly distributed and no particular region accounted for the majority of untimely services. The actual delay in the initiation of services ranged from 2 to 61 days beyond the 30-day threshold.

Upon further analysis, it was determined five of the 11 unacceptable reasons were due to Service Coordinator Delay, which accounted for the majority of the delays in two of the three SPOE regions. The remaining six unacceptable reasons (or 54.5% of the unacceptable reasons) were due to Provider Delay in the delivery of services for physical therapy, occupational therapy and speech/language pathology.

Additionally, three of the six Provider Delays were due to No Provider Available; however, there were no particular patterns in the service type or service area for No Provider Available.

In addition to the analysis of the 11 children with unacceptable reasons for untimely services, a broader look at the total services initiated for all 85 children revealed 161 services were initiated during 2012-13. Of the 161 services, 148 (91.9%) were provided in a timely manner or had an acceptable reason for initiating services beyond 30 days. This analysis indicated that, when looking at the total services initiated in 2012-13, the percentage of services initiated in timely manner (91.9%) was higher than results reported for this indicator (87.1%).

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 include the following:

- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators and providers on initiating timely IFSP services through a Transdisciplinary Team Approach
- Provide materials for Service Coordinators and providers to clarify policies/procedures related to initiation of services after initial IFSP decisions

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Transdisciplinary Team Approach: Missouri is implementing a statewide transdisciplinary model of service delivery, Early Intervention Teams (EIT), which includes the use of a Routines-Based Interview™ and a primary provider approach to service delivery.

As indicated in the SPOE contracts implemented July 1, 2009, SPOE agencies were to begin to implement the EIT model in each SPOE region as of July 1, 2010. In 2012-13, the contractual requirement for SPOEs to implement the EIT model increased to 100% from 50% of new families assigned to teams. This increase in requirements for assignment to teams boosted the statewide implementation of EIT.

In February 2012, a new online module on early intervention teaming was released to the public in order to provide basic information about working as a team. While this module is not required for all providers, the SPOE regions may require the training before a provider is placed on a team. This module was reviewed in 2012-13 and the updated version will be released in 2013-14.

Much of 2012-13 was spent on continued implementation of the EIT model through SPOE and provider training. With the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, the State developed four levels of training for Service Coordinators and providers who participate on teams. All four levels of training were disseminated in 2009-10 through 2011-12.

In 2012-13, there was a series of “catch up” trainings disseminated to new Service Coordinators and providers. Also in 2012-13, a fifth level of training was developed based on results from a statewide survey that targeted Service Coordinators’ and providers’ experiences with the implementation and use of teams. The fifth level of training will be disseminated in 2013-14 and the First Steps Area Directors will continue to support the development and training of teams across the State.

In June of each year, the State holds a SPOE contractor meeting with all SPOE directors and lead Service Coordinators in attendance. The purpose of the meeting is to reiterate early intervention rules and best practices in service delivery. In addition to the June meeting, ongoing discussions about progress and challenges to full implementation of the EIT model occurred at the quarterly SPOE meetings in September 2012 and April 2013.

Provide Materials: The First Steps Area Directors provide guidance on timely services, which indicates acceptable and unacceptable reasons for a delay in service delivery. Reasons include 1) parent/child reason for delay, 2) Service Coordinator reason for delay, 3) team decision to delay services, 4) provider delay, and 5) authorization/billing issue. The State uses a web-based child data and IFSP system, referred to as WebSPOE, to capture provider authorizations, provider progress notes and claims for service delivery. The WebSPOE prompts Service Coordinators to review provider progress notes each month via a monthly reminder for new provider progress notes that have not been reviewed.

In 2012-13, the First Steps Area Directors reviewed the guidance on timely services and provided technical assistance on how Service Coordinators should review provider progress notes to ensure timely

services are delivered. A Provider Service Request Form was previously developed for statewide use to help Service Coordinators and providers keep track of evaluation and service deadlines. The State modified the WebSPOE system to include an electronic version of this request form. The First Steps Area Directors continue to provide technical assistance regarding the provision of services in a timely manner.

A First Steps newsletter for providers was developed and disseminated to the public in the spring of 2013. This newsletter included an article on the results of the Annual Performance Report indicator 1: Timely Services and also included a link to guidance for delivering services in a timely manner to children and families.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: In FFY 2011, there were seven findings of noncompliance identified based on results from the review of 2010-11 records. See Overview for more information on Monitoring Procedures. The seven findings of noncompliance were discovered in four of the five SPOE agencies monitored in FFY 2011. Three SPOE agencies had two findings each and one SPOE agency had one finding. To verify correction of noncompliance, two updated files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	95.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 99.0%, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Primary Setting for children under 3 years of age with active IFSPs*	12/1/2010	%	12/1/2011	%	12/1/2012	%
Home	4,305	94.8%	4,765	94.8%	4,735	94.7%
Community-based Setting	186	4.1%	204	4.1%	216	4.3%
Total	4,491	98.9%	4,969	98.9%	4,951	99.0%
Program Designed for Children with Developmental Delay or Disabilities	43	1.0%	39	1.0%	39	0.8%
Service Provider Location	1	0.0%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hospital (Inpatient)	4	0.1%	2	0.0%	2	0.0%
Other Setting	0	0.0%	8	0.1%	6	0.1%
Residential Facility	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
Total Other	48	1.1%	55	1.1%	48	1.0%
Total	4,539	100.0%	5,024	100.0%	4,999	100.0%

*Data based on 618 Table 2

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

The State continues to show a very high percentage (>95%) of children receiving services in the natural environment.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs identified through evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve/maintain performance on this indicator
- Implement a review of IFSPs to assess Service Coordinator practices

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Targeted Technical Assistance: Data reports are posted monthly to the Department's website. Data on primary setting for direct services are reviewed by the First Steps Area Directors on a quarterly basis. As a result of quarterly data reviews, the State determined a majority of services were provided in the natural environment throughout 2012-13. In the event that less than 95% of children were being served in a setting other than the natural environment, the Area Directors provided technical assistance on natural environment settings to the identified SPOE.

The lead agency has online training available to provide basic information about the First Steps program. There are six modules in the training series that address the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement and delivery of services in the natural environment. In February 2012, the online training modules were updated to align with the new federal regulations. These modules were reviewed again in 2012-13 and updated versions will be released in 2013-14.

In 2012-13, the lead agency conducted statewide Service Coordinator and provider surveys via Survey Monkey to generate data around services in the natural environments as it related to the Early Intervention Team (EIT) model. The First Steps Area Directors compiled and used the survey results to provide targeted technical assistance throughout the SPOE regions. The survey results were also used to create a new training with a focus on support-based home visits that enhance the delivery of services in the natural environment. The training will be disseminated in 2013-14.

Review IFSPs to assess Service Coordinator Practices: In order to ensure that IFSP teams are making individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, the Area Directors conduct a review of the quality of IFSPs. The review includes any natural environment justification statement in the event that services are provided in a setting other than the natural environment. All training materials, including a manual and handouts, used for this review are posted on the Office of Special Education website at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/QualityIndicatorScale.html>.

For 2012-13, the SPOE contract required each region receive an overall score on the quality review in the "acceptable" to "high quality" range or liquidated damages would be applied to the next year's contract in an amount equal to one-half percent of the previous contract price. In 2012-13, each of the SPOE regions reviewed received ratings at the acceptable or quality level; therefore, no penalty was applied to the contract renewal for 2012-13 based on the review.

The Area Directors review the results with each SPOE agency and hold training activities targeted to continue strengthening the quality of IFSP development. These efforts are intended to ensure all children and families receive high quality intervention services through the First Steps program.

In 2012-13, the State determined the need to review more than just the child's IFSP document in order to get a comprehensive picture of a child's experience in First Steps. Therefore, the State is revising the current procedures and will conduct a pilot of the new procedures for a quality review in 2013-14.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $[\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c)} + \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)}] \div [\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a)} + \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b)} + \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c)} + \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)}] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
2012-13	Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
	Summary Statement 1	69.2%	70.4%	73.1%
	Summary Statement 2	47.5%	45.6%	36.2%

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

Missouri met all targets for Summary Statement 1 but did not meet all targets for Summary Statement 2.

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	53	1.9%	73	2.6%	74	2.6%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	454	15.9%	419	14.6%	405	14.2%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	1,256	43.9%	1,267	44.3%	1,492	52.1%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	660	23.1%	756	26.4%	656	22.9%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	439	15.3%	347	12.1%	235	8.2%
Total	2,862	100.0%	2,862	100.0%	2,862	100.0%

Summary Statements:

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	79.1%	80.4%	81.8%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited	38.4%	38.5%	31.1%

Definition of “comparable to same-aged peers”: Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the First Steps personnel, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1-5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):

- Each eligible child entering First Steps or Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months
- First Steps personnel determine the appropriate tool(s) to collect assessment results for this indicator as personnel are not required to use a specific assessment instrument. However, First Steps and ECSE must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. After reviewing the use of the three sources of information for collecting ECO data, the State decided to conduct a First Steps pilot in 2012-13 to embed the ECO collection in IFSP meeting activities.
- In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C APR. This form is currently used by all local programs and can be viewed at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department
- Entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely”
- Since February 2011, all First Steps entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system known as WebSPOE and the State analyzes the data at the end of each fiscal year. The reporting year for 2012-13 was the second full year that all ECO data for this indicator were pulled from WebSPOE instead of a manual tracking form. For the second consecutive year, the State continued to see an increase in the number of children with ECO data recorded in WebSPOE.
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Missouri made improvement and met all targets for Summary Statement 1 (SS1) for each of the three outcome areas. However, Missouri had slippage and did not meet the targets for Summary Statement 2 (SS2) in the three outcome areas.

Results indicate children who enter First Steps below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exit as reflected in Summary Statement 1; however, children are not necessarily functioning at age expectation by the time they exit as reflected in Summary Statement 2. This trend is indicative of the State's eligibility criteria, since Missouri has narrow eligibility criteria of half-age developmental delay and does not serve at-risk children.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children continue to be eligible for and receive services in Part B, ECSE. Data from the Part B program show that children receiving services in ECSE continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes. (See Part B APR, Indicator 7).

Given the results for the summary statements reported in this APR, a closer examination of the 2012-13 ECO data was conducted in order to determine if any regional differences existed for either summary statement. For SS1, seven of the 10 SPOE regions showed improvement over last year's scores, with an average increase of 7%. Of the remaining three regions, one region had slippage and two regions remained the same. For SS 2, seven of the 10 SPOE regions showed slippage over last year's scores, with an average decrease of 11%. The remaining three SPOE regions showed slight improvement over last year's scores.

The results reported in this APR maintain the trend of increasing SS1 percentages and decreasing SS2 percentages in Missouri's ECO data. The State believes this trend has been due to the original ECO

procedures utilized by First Steps personnel (i.e., reporting data primarily via parent input), which led to higher scores in the entry and exit ratings reported in previous APR submissions. Because of this trend, the State planned and implemented modifications to the ECO procedures in 2012-13, which the State believes contributed to increased differences in the data reported in this APR.

New ECO procedures introduced in 2012-13 included the use of an ECO Decision Tree during the determination of ECO ratings and a pilot project in two regions of the state. The decision tree was developed by the National ECO Center and modified, with permission from the center, for Missouri's use. Though the pilot project required the Service Coordinators in the pilot to use of the decision tree, the rest of the state was not required to use it; however, other Service Coordinators in the state chose to use the ECO Decision Tree during 2012-13.

An analysis of pilot data was conducted in 2012-13 and preliminary results showed the use of the decision tree resulted in lower entry and exit scores but a high level of consistency in ratings between the regions. Because more regions are using the decision tree, there is increased consistency in the ratings. Additionally, given the lower entry scores, the child is more likely to show progress, which will increase the percentage in SS1; however, lower exit scores will result in the child less likely to show the child was functioning within age expectations upon exiting the program, which will decrease the percentage in SS2.

Therefore, the State attributed the results for increasing SS1 and decreasing SS2 reported in this APR to the change in procedures for the collection and determination of ECO ratings.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide ECO training through periodic face-to-face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes
- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers in Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data
- Provide targeted technical assistance to agencies identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting State targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Training: All ECO training materials, including a video presentation, handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at: <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>. All materials are accessible to the general public; however, the video presentation requires registration prior to access. In 2011-12, the number of individuals from public schools, higher education, early intervention and other professions registering to take the module was 24. In 2012-13, the number increased to 32 individuals from similar professions. Although the number increased slightly, the number is a low representation of professionals working in the First Steps program. In order to ensure training information is current and accessible to professionals, the State is considering revisions to the video presentation and the online module in 2013-14.

In addition to the online materials, the State conducted ECO training via webinar in 2012-13, which included an introduction to using the ECO Decision Tree during the determination of ECO ratings. The decision tree was developed by the National ECO Center and modified, with permission from the center, for Missouri's use. Additional training on the use of the decision tree will occur in 2013-14.

In 2012-13 the State reconvened the former ECO work group that was comprised of State Part C and Part B staff and expanded the group to include Service Coordinators and school district personnel in order to have a more comprehensive group. The purpose of reconvening the group and including personnel from the field was to discuss current practices and consider recommendations for changes in procedures. The work group met once in 2012-13 to review what's working and what's not working with ECO in Missouri. The work group developed a list of recommendations for the State to consider for ECO procedures in 2013-14.

First Steps personnel receive regular reminders through Listserv messages regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training Service Coordinators on the collection and timely, accurate reporting of ECO data.

Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO Data: In 2012-13, all First Steps entry and exit data were entered into WebSPOE instead of a manual process of collecting data on spreadsheets. As a result of moving to the electronic system, which includes the MOSIS ID numbers, the State is better able to match data between the First Steps and ECSE programs.

In previous years, State staff found First Steps personnel were reporting data primarily via parent input while ECSE personnel were reporting data primarily via assessment results. Therefore, the State modified the data collection procedures for ECO so all First Steps and ECSE ratings must include three sources of information: parent input, professional observation and assessment results. In 2012-13, the State encouraged First Steps and ECSE personnel to collaborate in the assignment of a First Steps exit rating in order for the ECSE entry rating to be the same. However, the ECO work group described above has been tasked with reviewing current procedures as they relate to collaborating on the ratings and sharing ECO information between First Steps and ECSE. The work group is expected to provide the State with recommendations for action in 2013-14.

In the past, State staff performed cross checks to determine the number of First Steps exit ratings that matched the ECSE entry ratings. Cross checks in 2012-13 revealed that First Steps exit and ECSE entry ratings matched for approximately 25% of the children.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: Ongoing discussions about ECO procedures occur regularly throughout the SPOE regions. Additionally, when requested by SPOE personnel, the Area Directors provide technical assistance on ECO by fielding questions and attending staff meetings. Technical assistance regarding the determination of ECO ratings and the data collection process will continue in 2013-14, as needed.

Part C State staff attended the 2012 national conference on Measuring & Improving Child & Family Outcomes in order to review the procedures utilized in other States and to review the national materials regarding ECO policies. Information from the national conference led to the State's implementation of a pilot project in 2012-13.

The Part C ECO pilot began October 1, 2012 in two of the ten SPOE regions. The procedures for ECO collection and rating determination changed slightly with the requirement to use the decision tree, a new collection form and discussion about child progress at each required IFSP meeting (i.e., every 6 months). Approximately half the Service Coordinators in each of the two regions participated in the pilot. This allowed the State to compare ECO procedures and ratings within and between each pilot region to ECO procedures and ratings outside the pilot regions. Preliminary data was collected in 2012-13 and will be shared with the ECO work group in 2013-14 in order to determine the possibility for expansion of the pilot project to a statewide practice for collecting and rating ECO for all children in Part C.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must report progress and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.

Department Response: The State has reported progress and actual target data for FFY 2012 in this APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	4A, 4B, 4C: 95% of parents will agree or strongly agree with the survey items

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 96.9%, 97.8% and 98.6% agreement, respectively, Missouri met the targets for this indicator.

Survey Instrument: The complete family survey can be found at

<http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/documents/FirstStepsFamilySurveyFINALVERSION.pdf>

Survey Methodology: As noted in previous APR submissions, the Department worked with the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) to evaluate the representativeness and reliability of the First Steps Family Survey. As a result of this collaboration, changes to the 2007 survey included the addition of new items designed to meet the reporting requirements for this APR and to enhance subsequent analysis of survey data. In addition, a split survey methodology was used in 2007 to explore the use of sampling versus a census approach to gathering yearly data.

Several conclusions were drawn from analyzing the 2007 data from the split survey design:

- The two methods resulted in very similar rates of agreement
- No non-response bias was evident by using the census methodology
- Response rates by SPOE region did not differ between the two methodologies
- Survey results were representative of the State as a whole
- Either method (census or sample) is appropriate and produces valid and reliable data that adequately represent the population of the First Steps program.

For 2012-13, the census methodology was utilized and surveys mailed to all families with a child in active IFSP status. If a family had more than one child in First Steps, the family received more than one survey. The response rate for 2012-13 was 23%, which is a slight increase from the previous rate of 20.8%. An analysis of responses by SPOE indicates the response rates are comparable across the State. For results from previous years, see: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html#OtherReports>.

Family Survey Data

A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights

Q10. I received information and explanations about our family's rights to file a child complaint.

Response	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012	Family Survey 2013		
Strongly Agree	95.1%	94.4%	716	61.5%	95.5%*
Agree			396	34.0%	
Disagree	4.9%	5.6%	43	3.7%	4.5%
Strongly Disagree			10	0.8%	

Q11. I received information and explanations about our family's parental rights.

Response	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012	Family Survey 2013		
Strongly Agree	98.4%	97.9%	757	64.8%	98.2%*
Agree			390	33.4%	
Disagree	1.6%	2.1%	18	1.5%	1.8%
Strongly Disagree			3	0.3%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4A: Average of 95.5% and 98.2% = 96.9%**

B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs¹

Q24. We are able to find and use the services and programs available to us.

Response	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012	Family Survey 2013		
Strongly Agree	98.1%	98.2%	712	61.9%	97.4%*
Agree			408	35.5%	
Disagree	1.9%	1.8%	27	2.4%	2.6%
Strongly Disagree			3	0.2%	

Q25. We know who to contact and what to do when we have questions or concerns.

Response	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012	Family Survey 2013		
Strongly Agree	96.3%	96.2%	796	68.8%	98.1%*
Agree			339	29.3%	
Disagree	3.7%	3.8%	20	1.7%	1.9%
Strongly Disagree			1	0.2%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4B: Average of 97.4% and 98.1% = 97.8%**

¹Note: The wording in Q24 and Q25 was changed in 2012-13 based on an analysis of survey data; however, the intent did not change the measurement of early intervention services that helped the family communicate their children's needs.

C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn

Q19. First Steps services give my family the tools to directly improve my child's development.

Response	Family Survey 2011	Family Survey 2012	Family Survey 2013		
Strongly Agree	97.7%	98.0%	833	72.0%	98.6%*
Agree			308	26.6%	
Disagree	2.3%	2.0%	9	0.8%	1.4%
Strongly Disagree			7	0.6%	

*Affirmative response for question related to Indicator 4C: 98.6%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

The State made improvement in each area and met the 2012-13 targets for indicators 4A, 4B and 4C.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Support Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families
- Collaborate with existing family mentor programs to support First Steps families
- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators based on results of First Steps family survey

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Training, Resources and Materials to Families: MPACT was contracted to disseminate the *Steps to Success* training series in 2012-13. The series provides information to families on how to work effectively with teams, understand the early intervention process and understand their rights. The series also provides professionals with an understanding of the First Steps program. The following training modules are included in the series: Effectively Communicating Your Child's Needs, Family Record Keeping, IDEA Part C to B Transition, Understanding First Steps Parental Rights, and Understanding the IFSP Process. Implementation of the series in 2012-13 included dissemination to MPACT staff and MPACT Parent Mentors to ensure their understanding of the First Steps program.

During 2012-13, trainings from the *Steps for Success* series were conducted for parents and agency personnel (including First Steps, Head Start, ECSE and MPACT staff) in locations across the State. The training schedule included the following:

- Seven trainings on *Effectively Communicating Your Child's Needs*
- Two trainings on *Family Record Keeping*
- One training on *IDEA Part C to B Transition*
- Six trainings on *Understanding First Steps Parental Rights*
- Two trainings on *Understanding the IFSP Process*

Approximately 34 families and professionals accessed the series during 2012-13. Data collected from the training evaluations indicate 100% of the respondents agreed the training and handouts were of high quality, 94% of the respondents agreed the information presented was relevant, 83% of the respondents agreed they will use this information for their child's education, 100% of the respondents agreed they will use this information to support other families, and 72% of the respondents agreed they will use this information to improve educational policy and practice. Additional regional training for families and professionals is planned for 2013-14.

Each year MPACT analyzes the family survey data for two purposes. First, MPACT uses the survey analysis to provide recommendations to the State for changes to the survey items. In 2012-13, MPACT recommended revisions to the wording in several questions in order to clarify the intent of the question. The State made several changes to survey items, including the two key questions that are used to compile the results for 4B. Further analysis of the survey data will continue to assist the State in revisions to the format of the survey for 2013-14.

Second, in the survey analysis, MPACT focuses on a small number of key questions to develop topics for the parent newsletters. In addition to the family survey results, the topics for parent newsletters may be determined by a review of program data and content selected by the local programs or the State. The newsletters are disseminated to all families receiving First Steps services. In 2012-13, the topics addressed in parent newsletters included: Overview of the Use of Insurance in First Steps, Family Resources, Annual Family Survey Results, and Parent Participation in First Steps Interagency Councils. The information gathered from an analysis of the 2012-13 family survey results will become topics for the 2013-14 newsletters.

Family Mentor System: During 2012-13, the State continued the SICC discussions on family leadership and network of support as it relates to a family mentor system. Members of the council presented options for developing parent leadership through existing infrastructures such as other agency systems, regional councils and committee work through the State council. In 2012-13, the council worked on the creation of a sub-committee of parents to specifically assist the council and State with parent engagement and leadership. The sub-committee is expected to be formed in 2013-14. Discussions about a family mentor program will continue in 2013-14 in order to examine the feasibility of using existing family mentor programs to connect First Steps families with mentors.

Service Coordinator Trainings: State staff conducted quarterly SPOE Director meetings and/or trainings as a way to ensure guidance is disseminated and current practice is in place. In addition to the State meetings, monthly staff meetings/trainings between SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators occur in most regions and consist of reminders or updates to policies and procedures. SPOE Director meetings and Service Coordinator trainings conducted by the State in 2012-13 consisted of the following topics: Transition C to B, Early Childhood Outcomes, Compliance Monitoring Procedures, Parental Consent, Child/Family Assessment, and Service Delivery through Early Intervention Teams. SPOE Director meetings will continue to be held on a quarterly basis and subsequent trainings with Service Coordinators will be held on an as needed basis in 2013-14.

To assist with future training and survey procedures, State staff attended the 2012 national conference on Measuring & Improving Child & Family Outcomes to review the national materials for ECO and Family Outcomes. Information from the national conference led to the State's revision of the family survey procedures and content of the survey. The revised family survey will be utilized for children exiting the program in 2013-14.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	0.85% of infants and toddlers birth to 1 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 0.98% of children birth to age 1 served by First Steps, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 1 with IFSPs

Description	December 2010	December 2011	December 2012
Child Count	703	730	721
Estimated Population*	76,119	74,978	73,870
Percent of children birth to 1 – Missouri	0.92%	0.97%	0.98%
Percent of children birth to 1 – National	1.03%	1.02%	1.06%

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Though the number of children birth to age 1 decreased by 1.2%, the estimated population decreased by 1.5% and Missouri met the target for 2012-13.

The Improvement Activity for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide information and/or resources to primary referral sources in order to improve child find procedures, reduce inappropriate referrals, and target underserved populations

Discussion of the Improvement Activity follows:

Provide Information/Resources to Primary Referral Sources: Missouri is pleased that the child find activities currently conducted in the SPOE regions are working as the child count percentage continues to increase despite the recent decrease in Missouri's population of young children. However, there continues to be a need to assist the SPOEs in educating parents and primary referral sources about the First Steps program in order to appropriately identify eligible children and maintain Missouri's child count.

SPOE Directors and Area Directors participated in various State and local early childhood conferences, such as the Missouri Speech and Hearing Association Annual Convention and the Missouri Division for Early Childhood (DEC) conference to share referral information and procedures. Conference attendees received information regarding the First Steps program including eligibility requirements and referral procedures.

In 2012-13, Area Directors and SPOE Directors assisted the Parents as Teachers (PAT) National Center, located in St. Louis, Missouri, with facilitating First Steps presentations at special needs training and in-

services for PAT educators. At these presentations, information was shared regarding the First Steps program, including IDEA, eligibility criteria, facilitating appropriate referrals and referral procedures. Additionally, each Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) also reported collaboration with PAT as well as local hospitals, physician's offices, Early Head Start offices, the Department of Mental Health and local early childhood programs.

State staff participated in the Missouri Head Start advisory council and Missouri's SpecialQuest Birth-5 Initiative in order to support local efforts in providing collaborative high quality services to families of children with disabilities. Collaboration throughout 2012-13 included the areas of referral, eligibility criteria, professional development, transition and inclusion.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	1.67% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 2.23% of children birth to 3 served by First Steps, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 3 with IFSPs

Description	December 2010	December 2011	December 2012
Child Count	4,539	5,024	4,999
Estimated Population*	231,982	226,932	224,519
Percent of children birth to 3 – Missouri	1.96%	2.21%	2.23%
Percent of children birth to 3 – National	2.82%	2.79%	2.77%

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Though the number of children birth to age 3 decreased by 0.5%, the estimated population decreased by 1.1% and Missouri met the target for 2012-13.

See Indicator 5 for discussion of Improvement Activities related to this indicator.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)}}{\text{(\# of infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely evaluations assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	100.0% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timelines

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 94.0%, Missouri did not meet the target for this indicator.

45-Day Timeline Data:

Data reported below were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures. See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures." Indicator 7 results were based on a review of one randomly selected initial IFSP file for every Intake Service Coordinator from five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Initial IFSPs	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Number of children with initial IFSPs within acceptable timelines*	72	56	62
Total initial IFSPs	75	56	66
Percent of children with initial IFSPs within acceptable timelines	96.0%	100.0%	94.0%

*"Acceptable timelines" includes those evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within the 45-day timeline as well as those that went over 45 days due to parent or child reasons. Both the IFSPs with acceptable timelines (numerator) and the total IFSPs (denominator) include delays due to exceptional family circumstances.

In Missouri, SPOEs are monitored for compliance with the 45-day timeline by calculating the actual number of days from referral to initial IFSP for an eligible child.

The only acceptable reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline is a Parent/Child Delay, which indicates an exceptional family circumstance (e.g., child illness/hospitalization, family vacation, and unable to locate family).

In 2012-13, a total of 66 records were reviewed for 45-day timeline. Of the 66 records, 55 children had an initial IFSP within the 45-day timeline and seven children had an acceptable reason for the delay in an initial IFSP within 45 days; for a total of 62 IFSPs with acceptable timelines.

Unacceptable reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline include: Provider Delay, Service Coordinator Delay, and No Provider Available. A Provider Delay indicates the provider was the reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline (e.g., not scheduling the evaluation with the family, not providing the evaluation report). A Service Coordinator Delay indicates the Service Coordinator was the reason for exceeding the 45-day timeline (e.g., Service Coordinator vacation, illness, unavailability). A delay due to No Provider Available indicates no provider could be located to evaluate the child or assist in the eligibility determination process.

The following table provides detail on the reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline:

45-Day Timeline Calculation Details	Number
Initial IFSPs under 45 days	55
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with acceptable reasons	7
Total under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	62
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with unacceptable reasons	4
Total Initial IFSPs	66
Percent under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	94.0%

For the children listed above whose initial IFSPs were over 45 days, delays ranged from 1 to 41 days beyond the 45-day timeline. Acceptable reasons for these delays were due to child or family illness/hospitalization and the family's schedule. Unacceptable reasons included provider illness, waiting for medical records and Service Coordinator delay in contacting the family.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

The State did not meet the target of 100.0% compliance and slippage from the previous year is reported. The State conducted an analysis of the monitoring data to determine if there were trends in the data. Upon analysis of the four unacceptable reasons for meeting the 45-day timeline, it was determined three of the five SPOE regions had unacceptable reasons for the delay. Two of the four unacceptable reasons were due to Service Coordinator delays and two were due to provider delays. While slippage from the previous year is reported, the identified noncompliance was due to isolated events, resulting in no pattern in the practices of a particular SPOE region or provider type.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs not in compliance with 45-day timeline requirements
- Provide training and professional development to SPOEs and providers in the area of 45-day timelines

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The State reported 100% compliance on this indicator in the previous APR; therefore, targeted technical assistance was not provided.

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency conducts quarterly meetings with all ten SPOE agencies, which includes attendance by the SPOE Directors, lead Service Coordinators and Area Directors. During these meetings, the SPOE staff share challenges related to SPOE operations and ask questions regarding Department policies and procedures. In 2012-13, the Area Directors provided trainings to all SPOE regions on the 45-day timeline, which involved a review of guidance documents,

group discussion and activities to practice how to determine the appropriate reason for a delay in the 45-day timeline.

With the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, the State developed four levels of training for providers who participate on Early Intervention Teams, including content on considerations for the IFSP process. All four levels of training were disseminated in 2009-10 through 2011-12. In 2012-13, there was a series of “catch up” trainings disseminated to new providers and Service Coordinators. Technical assistance and follow up was given to providers on an as-needed basis. Ongoing technical assistance and training new providers will continue in 2013-14.

Much of 2012-13 was spent developing and disseminating surveys to providers and Service Coordinators’ about their experiences with teams, including items related to IFSP team meetings and timelines. Additionally, survey responses were compiled and shared with stakeholders in 2012-13. Results from the survey will be used to develop additional training to be disseminated in 2013-14.

In February 2012, the online training modules were updated to align with the new federal regulations for 45-day timeline and IFSP practices. There are six modules in the training series, four of which relate to compliance practices in the 45-day timeline and transition requirements. All four modules are required training for new providers and Service Coordinators. These modules were reviewed in 2012-13 and updated versions will be released in 2013-14.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2011-12, which was based on results from the review of 2010-11 records, because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for 8A
2012-13	100% of toddlers have an IFSP with transition steps and services developed at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday

Actual Target Data for 2012-13: At 48.0%, Missouri did not meet the target.

Data reported below were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures. See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures." Indicator 8A results were based on a review of one randomly selected transition file, if available, for every Service Coordinator from five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Description	Number of Children
Number of children exiting Part C	56
Number of late referrals*	6
Number of children with IFSPs requiring transition steps and services within acceptable timelines	50
Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services held within acceptable timelines	23
Number of children with IFSPs with transition steps and services delayed due to exceptional family circumstances**	1
Number of children with IFSPs with transition steps and services held within acceptable timelines	24
Percent of all children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services held within acceptable timelines	48%

*Six late referrals. Three children were referred between 103 and 94 days before their third birthdays. Three children were referred less than 90 days before their third birthday. In each case the transition plan IFSP meeting was held in conjunction with the initial IFSP meeting which was less than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. These six late referrals were excluded from the calculation for indicator 8A.

**Exceptional family circumstance. One child's transition plan IFSP meeting was delayed five days due to parent scheduling but the child's IFSP included transition steps and services. This exceptional family circumstance was included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8A.

The following table provides detail on the reasons for IFSPs without transition steps and services and/or not held within acceptable timelines:

Description	Number of Children
Number of IFSPs <i>without</i> transition steps and services but held within acceptable timelines	22
Number of IFSPs <i>without</i> transition steps and services and not held within acceptable timelines	2
Number of IFSPs delayed due to exceptional family circumstances <i>without</i> transition steps and services*	1
Number of IFSPs <i>with</i> transition steps and services but untimely transition plan	1
Number of children with IFSPs without transition steps and services held within acceptable timelines	26

* Exceptional family circumstance. One child's transition plan IFSP meeting was delayed 83 days due to parent relocated shortly before the transition timeline; however, the child's IFSP did not include all transition steps and services. This exceptional family circumstance was included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8A.

Upon a closer look at the 26 IFSPs that did not have complete transition steps and services confirmed in the transition plan, the State determined Service Coordinators documented *some* of the steps and

services in 22 records (85%); however, *all* required transition steps and services were not documented in order to meet compliance for this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for 8B
2012-13	100% of toddlers had notification sent (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

Actual Target Data for 2011-12: At 84.8% for notification to LEA, Missouri did not meet the target. ***

Data reported below were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures. See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures." Indicator 8B results were based on a review of one randomly selected transition file, if available, for every Service Coordinator from five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Description	Notification to LEA ***
Number of children exiting Part C	56
Number of late referrals*	6
Number of parents who opted out, in writing, of notification**	4
Number of children exiting who require timely notification	46
Number of children exiting who had timely notification	39
Percent of children exiting who had timely notification	84.8%

*Six late referrals. Three children were referred between 103 and 94 days before their third birthdays. Three children were referred less than 90 days before their third birthday. These six late referrals were excluded from the calculation for indicator 8B.

**Four parents opted out, in writing, of notification. Missouri has an opt out policy that was approved by OSEP in 2009. The current opt out policy is available in the current Missouri Part C State Plan for Special Education at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/DirectoryInfoandOptOutPolicy.html>. These four opt out instances were excluded from the calculation for indicator 8B.

*** Notification to SEA. In 2011-12, the State's electronic child record system was modified to include an optional data collection point for the parent's decision to opt out. This was added in anticipation of conducting SEA notification. In 2012-13, the State developed an intra-agency agreement that included the requirement for SEA notification. The agreement was signed by all parties in February 2013. The State immediately developed a template and procedures for SEA notification per the process outlined in the agreement. The State then attempted to obtain notification and opt out information from the electronic child record system. Part C staff could successfully identify all children approaching transition timeline per SEA notification requirements; however, before the first SEA notification was completed, Part C staff cross-checked opt out data in the electronic system with LEA notification and found numerous instances where the parent opted out but the child's electronic record did not indicate opt out. Due to the concern that Part C staff may inadvertently notify Part B staff when the parent had opted out, the State did not successfully conduct SEA notification. The State is revising its data system to ensure opt out information is a separate, required data collection point in order for the State to identify, with certainty, the parents who opt out.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for 8C
2012-13	100% of toddlers had a transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

Actual Target Data for 2012-13: At 92.9%, Missouri did not meet the target.

Data reported below were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures. See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures." Indicator 8C results were based on a review of one randomly selected transition file, if available, for every Service Coordinator from five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Description	Number of Children
Number of children exiting Part C	56
Number of late referrals*	6
Number of parents who opted out of notification or declined to hold a transition conference**	8
Number of children who had a timely transition conference	42
Number of timely transition conferences	37
Number of transition conferences delayed due to exceptional family circumstance***	2
Number of children who had timely transition conference	39
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received a timely transition conference or delay due to exceptional family circumstances	92.9%

*Six late referrals. Three children were referred between 103 and 94 days before their third birthdays. Three children were referred less than 90 days before their third birthday. These six late referrals were excluded from the calculation for indicator 8C.

**Eight parents opted out or declined. Four parents opted out, in writing. Four parents declined to hold a transition conference. These eight circumstances were excluded from the calculation for indicator 8C.

***Two exceptional family circumstances. One child's transition conference was delayed five days due to parent scheduling. One child's transition conference was delayed 83 days due to the family relocated shortly before the transition timeline. These two exceptional family circumstances were included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8C.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Missouri's performance on 8A slipped from 98.4% to 48.0%; performance on 8B slipped from 95.1% to 84.8%; and performance on 8C slipped from 100% to 92.9%.

Trend data for 8A:

Year	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Percent in compliance (8A)	100.0%	98.4%	48.0%

For 8A, similar to previous reporting years, the transition plan IFSP must include steps and services to be taken to support the smooth transition of the child, including: (1) discussions with, and training of, parents, as appropriate, regarding future placements and other matters related to the child's transition; (2) procedures to prepare the child for changes in service delivery, including steps to help the child adjust to, and function in, a new setting; and (3) identification of transition services and other activities that the IFSP team determines are necessary to support the transition of the child.

However, new requirements for this reporting year per Part C federal regulations indicated the transition plan IFSP must also be timely and include: (i) confirmation that child find information about the child has been transmitted to the LEA in accordance with the State's opt out policy, (ii) with parental consent, transmission of additional information, including (a) a copy of the most recent evaluation and assessments of the child and the family and (b) most recent IFSP.

While these transition activities are not new practice for Service Coordinators, documentation of the completion of these activities in the transition plan IFSP was a new requirement reported for this indicator.

When considering the new requirement for timely transition planning, 47 of 50 (94%) of the transition plan IFSP meetings were held on time or had family exceptional circumstances for the delay.

However, when considering the new requirement for confirmation in the transition plan IFSP that certain information was sent to LEA, the State found 26 of the 50 transition plan IFSPs (48%) did not have *all* transition steps and services confirmed in the IFSP. Further analysis of the missing transition steps and services revealed 22 of the 26 records (85%) were missing confirmation in the IFSP that: (1) with parent consent, the most recent evaluation and assessments were sent to the LEA, or (2) there were no recent evaluation and assessments to send to the LEA.

Therefore, the State estimates the lower percentage reported in the results for indicator 8A were primarily due to the new requirements to document confirmation in the transition plan IFSP that the most recent evaluation and assessments were sent to the LEA or that there were no recent evaluation and assessments to send to the LEA. This practice was found in all five SPOE regions monitored for data reported in this APR and also found across multiple Service Coordinators in the regions, thus no pattern of noncompliance was found in any particular region or Service Coordinator practice.

Trend data for 8B:

Year	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Percent in compliance for notification to LEA (8B)*	100.0%	95.1%	84.8%

*For SEA notification, see prior note for Notification to SEA under the actual target data 8B.

For notification to LEA, similar to previous reporting years, all children in Missouri Part C are potentially eligible for Part B and LEA notification must be made unless the child's parent opted out in writing per Missouri's opt out policy.

However, a new requirement for this reporting year, based on Part C federal regulations changes in 2011, was the LEA notification must be timely, which is defined as at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

While LEA notification is not a new practice for Service Coordinators, documentation of LEA notification within timelines was a new requirement reported in this indicator.

In 2012-13, there were a total of 56 records reviewed, but six children had late referrals and four children had parents who opted out; therefore, these ten records were excluded from the calculation, leaving 46 records reported for indicator 8B.

Upon analysis of the results for indicator 8B, it was determined 43 out of the 46 records (93.5%) had notification to LEA regardless of the timeliness of the notification. This percentage is similar to last year's results of 95.1%. However, when considering the new requirement for timely LEA notification, only 39 of the 46 records (84.8%) met the new requirement for timelines.

Upon further analysis of the results for 8B, it was determined the remaining seven records (15.2%) did not have documentation of timely LEA notification or documentation that the parent opted out in writing. After a closer look at the seven instances, it was determined the seven records were from three different regions and different Service Coordinators. Thus, the State concluded the slippage in LEA notification was due to isolated instances.

Trend data for 8C:

Year	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Percent in compliance (8C)	100.0%	100.0%	92.9%

In 2012-13, there were a total of 56 records reviewed for indicator 8C, but six children had late referrals and eight children had parents who opted out or declined transition conference. As a result, these 14 records were excluded from the calculation, leaving 42 records reported in indicator 8C.

Upon analysis of the results for 8C, it was determined three of the 42 records did not have a timely transition conference. These three records were from two different regions and three different Service Coordinators. Thus, the State concluded the slippage in transition conference timeline was due to isolated instances.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development to all SPOE agencies to improve collaboration and coordination with families and school districts in the area of C to B Transition, including IFSPs with transition steps and services, notification to LEA, and timelines

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The Department maintains a webpage specifically for Transition C to B topics in order to organize all transition training materials and technical assistance documents in one place. This page can be viewed at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/Transitionindexpg.htm>. In the past, statewide Transition C to B training was conducted in the spring of every other year. However, due to travel restraints and increased access to technology, the State considered alternative methods to delivering C to B trainings.

At the State level, an online training module about transition from First Steps is available on the Department's website at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/moduletraining.html>. In February 2012, the online training module was updated to align with the new federal regulations. Service Coordinators and providers currently enrolled in the First Steps program were encouraged to review the new module; however, new Service Coordinators and providers are required to take the module. This module was reviewed again in 2012-13 and an updated version will be released in 2013-14.

Webinars on Part C to B transition were conducted in October 2012 and March 2013 in order to inform the field about the requirements and timelines for both Part C and Part B. Staff from both Part C and Part B attended the webinars. Additionally, Part C staff presented the First Steps requirements at an Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Coalition meeting of ECSE directors in January 2013 and again in April 2013. Finally, Listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year.

At the local level, the SPOE prepares a packet of transition information, including a DVD and handbook about transition, for all families in Part C. Service Coordinators disseminate the packets to families as they begin discussions about the transition process.

In addition to the family packets, some regions held joint Part C and Part B meetings between SPOE staff and local ECSE staff to discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between the two programs to facilitate successful transitions for families. Regional interagency meetings have also included topics of discussion related to successful transition from Part C to Part B. The Area Directors provide ongoing technical assistance to SPOE Directors, Service Coordinators and school districts as needed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Indicator 8A

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: In FFY 2011, there was one finding of noncompliance issued for this indicator in 2011-12, which was based on results from the review of 2010-11 records. See Overview for more information on Monitoring Procedures. The one finding of noncompliance was discovered in one of the five SPOE agencies monitored in FFY 2011. To verify correction of noncompliance, two updated files were reviewed for the instance of noncompliance. The State was able to verify the SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For any instance of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE completed transition steps and services, although late, for that child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Indicator 8B

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: In FFY 2011, there were three findings of noncompliance issued for this indicator in 2011-12, which was based on results from the review of 2010-11 records. See Overview for more information on Monitoring Procedures. The three findings of noncompliance were discovered in three of the five SPOE agencies monitored in FFY 2011. Three SPOE agencies had one finding each. To verify correction of noncompliance, two updated files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE conducted LEA notification, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose notification to LEA was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Indicator 8C

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2011-12, which was based on results from the review of 2010-11 records, because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8A: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Department Response to Indicator 8A: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8B: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in

FFY 2011 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Department Response to Indicator 8B: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with identified noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8C: OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	100% of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 100% correction of noncompliance identified in 2011-12, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, Missouri requires 100% correction of identified noncompliance in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review. SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional State standards and indicators.

The Indicator 9 table reflects the findings related to the Indicator/Indicator Clusters for noncompliance identified in 2011-12 based on results from the review of 2010-11 records. Data in the Indicator 9 table may differ from data reported for correction of noncompliance under Indicators 1, 7 and 8 because the Indicator 9 table includes additional data related to the findings reported in Indicators 1, 7 and 8 as well as the actual data from those indicators.

The findings issued in 2011-12 and subsequent correction of those finding are reported in the following Indicator 9 table:

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	55	55
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Monitoring Activities:	4	25	25
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (7/1/11 through 6/30/12)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities:	3	8	8
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			88	88
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

The State maintained 100% correction of noncompliance for this indicator.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development through Area Directors to SPOEs for development and implementation of corrective action plans
- Manage/support a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency employs First Steps Area Directors to assist SPOEs with specific issues identified through compliance monitoring reviews, which includes assistance in developing and implementing corrective action plans. Training and/or individual technical assistance is provided in each SPOE region, as needed, to ensure SPOE staff are informed about and operating under compliant procedures.

General Supervision System: The lead agency supports two systems, IMACS and WebSPOE, which help to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. First, the IMACS system is a database that includes Part C compliance file reviews and corrective action plans. Second, the WebSPOE system is a database that contains all elements of referral, intake, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation for all children referred to First Steps. The system is compliance-driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice, which makes the WebSPOE system an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system.

As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages in the amount equal to one-half percent of the annual contract price.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance: Findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2011-12 based on results from the review of 2010-11 records. To verify correction of noncompliance, two updated files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance reported in the Indicator 9 table. The State was able to verify each SPOE with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing all specific regulatory requirements related to the identified noncompliance. For instances of individual child noncompliance, the State confirmed the SPOE: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. Therefore, the State verified all noncompliance was corrected within 12 months of notification consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2010 Findings of Noncompliance: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2010.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 1, 8A, and 8B in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the table for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State used the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

The State reported on correction of noncompliance for indicators 1, 8A, and 8B as described under those indicators in the APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to report on Indicator 10 in the FFY 2012 APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to report on Indicator 11 in the FFY 2012 APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

Not applicable as Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

Not applicable.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	Not set due to lack of baseline data

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

There were no mediation requests during 2012-13.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Not applicable.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions were made in the State Performance Plan. Per OSEP instructions, the State is not required to develop baseline, targets and Improvement Activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2012-13

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2012-13	100% of State reported data will be timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2012-13:

At 100%, Missouri met the target for this indicator.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- WebSPOE system - WebSPOE is a web-based system used to maintain child level data for the First Steps program. These data are used for the Section 618 child count, primary setting and exit reporting. WebSPOE is also used for APR Indicators 2, 3, 5, 6.
- Monitoring – data gathered through monitoring reviews are utilized for Indicators 1, 7, 8 and 9. The criteria used to collect this data are on the Department's website at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/compliance/StandardsManual/documents/3011-EIS.pdf> and <http://dese.mo.gov/se/compliance/StandardsManual/documents/changestoSImanual7-2013-partC.pdf>
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 10-13.
- Survey – The First Steps family survey is sent annually to all active families and includes a variety of questions related to family experience in the program. The family survey is used for APR Indicator 4.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2012-13:

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% for timely and accurate State reported data. All 618 data and required reports have been submitted on or before the due dates. OSEP data reports, as well as data submitted in the SPP/APR, are accurate as evidenced by the verification efforts described below.

Improvement Activities for 2012-13 included the following:

- Support the development and implementation of the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and the WebSPOE data system

- Provide information to Area Directors and SPOE Directors regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Data Systems: Missouri implemented the WebSPOE system on September 1, 2005 with enhancements released throughout 2012-13 to update the system. The WebSPOE system captures data elements of the Part C program and contains information about referral, intake, eligibility determination and IFSP development and implementation. The WebSPOE system is compliance-driven, meaning it requires critical data items and conducts edit checks on data to help ensure accuracy. The WebSPOE system supplies data that can be reviewed at the local and State levels for program evaluation and monitoring purposes. Much of the data for the SPP/APR comes from the WebSPOE system. In order to verify the accuracy of the data elements in WebSPOE, staff at the local, regional and state levels review various data reports on, at minimum, a monthly basis.

The Department has fully implemented a student-level data collection system, MOSIS. A Department workgroup, including special education data staff, identify and define the necessary data elements for MOSIS. The Department has worked to ensure definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. A key element of MOSIS is a unique identifier for each student, called the MOSIS ID. A MOSIS ID is obtained for every child in the First Steps program so data can be linked from the First Steps system to the Missouri PK-12 public school system. Extensive technical assistance to public schools and SPOEs ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

Data Reports: Throughout 2012-13, the State provided the public with monthly SPOE data reports of key indicators related to primary referral sources, eligibility rates, active child count and inactivation reasons. These reports are available at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html>. These reports are reviewed on a monthly basis by the Area Directors and the SPOE Directors to ensure accurate data collection and reporting. Monthly reports are analyzed by the Area Directors on a regular basis and technical assistance is provided to the SPOE on an as needed basis.

In January of each year, the State reviews the results of the SPP indicators with the SPOE Directors to verify accurate data and then the State publically reports the regional results of the SPP indicators. The regional report of SPP performance is available at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2012-13:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2011 (2011-12) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.